DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 112 24 SO 000 898

TITLE	National Assessment of Educational Progress. Summary of Report 2. Citizenship: National Results--Partial. Observations and Commentary of a Panel of Reviewers.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/CE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0771
PUB DATE	Jul 70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-08771-2468-508
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($.40)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, Achievement Rating, Adults, Attitude Tests, *Citizenship, Civic Belief, *Educational Objectives, Elementary School Students, High School Students, *Human Relations, Measurement Goals, *National Surveys, Political Attitudes, Political Socialization, Social Attitudes, Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*Accountability

ABSTRACT

Although issued by the National Assessment program, this collection of interpretations of its citizenship findings does not necessarily reflect the views of the program. It is not the purpose of the program to interpret its own findings, but rather to encourage widespread examination of the assessment results through such efforts as this document. The panel of reviewers and their reviews are: 1) Jean Dye's National Assessment Citizenship Findings which draws implications of the findings for public school curricula; 2) Harold H. Eibling's Comments on the Preliminary and Partial Findings of National Assessment in the Area of Citizenship commenting on the assessment of citizenship itself; 3) Tobe Johnson's Critical Response to the National Assessment; 4) Lawrence E. Metcalf's The Citizenship Education Assessment: Strengths of the Report; and, 5) Thomas Rondeau's Reaction to National Assessment - Citizenship. For the complete report of the citizenship results, by age groups, see SO 000 899. (DJB)

ED049112

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS
A Project of the Education Commission of the States

REPORT 2–CITIZENSHIP:
National Results-Partial

•

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTARY OF A PANEL OF REVIEWERS

•

JULY, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

$8.00 278

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

A Project of the Education Commission of the States

Tom McCall, Governor of Oregon, Chairman, Education Commission of the States
Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States
James A. Hazlett, Administrative Director, National Assessment

Assessment Reports

#1 Science: National Results July, 1970

#2 Citizenship: National Results - - Partial July, 1970

In addition to the detailed reports of National Assessment, brief summaries of the results and commentaries by a panel of reviewers are available.

-0-

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Center for Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

This report was made possible in part by funds granted by Carnegie Corporation of New York. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of National Assessment of Educational Progress, a project of the Education Commission of the States.

-0-

Education Commission of the States

DENVER OFFICE
822 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

ANN ARBOR OFFICE
Room 201A Huron Towers
2222 Fuller Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

ED049112

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTARY

OF A

PANEL OF REVIEWERS

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

A Project of the Education Commission of the States

Denver Office
822 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Ann Arbor Office
Room 201A Huron Towers
2222 Fuller Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

355-3631

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402
Price 40 cents

FOREWORD

The Education Commission of the States will issue National Assessment reports from time to time without interpreting the results or explaining their implications. This is partly because the National Assessment program is not an experimental design relating input variables to results and partly because the Commission does not want to assume the role of "authority" for what the reports may mean. The Commission will encourage through the years, however, thoughtful speculation about the implications of National Assessment for education.

To encourage examination of assessment results, the Commission has asked 10 people interested in science or citizenship education to give their reactions to National Assessment and to the results of the first two reports. It is hoped that these commentaries will assist others in evaluating the results.

These commentaries accompany the Science and Citizenship reports 1 and 2 (July, 1970), which should be read to place these commentaries in full perspective.

James A. Hazlett
Administrative Director for
National Assessment

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director
Education Commission of the States

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

National Assessment Citizenship Findings

Jean Dye 1

Comments on the Preliminary and Partial Findings of National Assessment in the Area of Citizenship

Harold H. Eibling 15

Critical Response to the National Assessment

Tobe Johnson. 21

The Citizenship Education Assessment: Strengths of the Report

Lawrence E. Metcalf 24

Reaction to National Assessment-Citizenship

Thomas Rondeau. 28

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT CITIZENSHIP FINDINGS

Jean Dye

Introduction

Preliminary findings of NAEP in the area of Citizenship have exciting implications for those of us who are charged with the responsibility of making meaningful decisions about the education of children and youth. Local school board members, such as myself, and other informed lay citizens, such as PTA leaders, can take heart from the evidence that significant portions of the population meet the criteria set up by scholars, school practitioners, and other lay citizens.

Basic to any analysis of these findings, however, must be a consideration of the goal and the role of the school: the function of the school board in the decision-making process; the new use of the informed lay citizen in developing school philosophy; and the whole relationship of National Assessment practices and procedures to this current educational scene.

GOAL OF THE SCHOOL

"It is assumed," wrote Ralph H. Ojemann, Director, Child Education Psychology and Preventive Psychiatry, Educational Research Council of America,* "that the ultimate goal of the school is the development of individuals who can continue living at their potential as long as their years will permit. We call this living constructively. Living constructively involves being able to meet the daily situations life presents and to work them out in ways that make it possible for the person to live at his potential and for others to do likewise." We must define, establish, and evaluate the ideals, the skills, the attitudes, the other developments essential to this living constructively.

---

* Modern Teenage Problems: Report of Family Life Education Survey of Ohio Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, April, 1969.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOL

In order to explore the role or function of the school board as the primary decision-maker in the educational process, it is essential that we first address ourselves to the role of the school itself. The school has a very definite responsibility to the family: it exists as a continuation, a supplement, a complement to the educational efforts of the family and at the same time contributes to the maintenance of the family as a living unit. These familial responsibilities include the preservation of moral and spiritual values and the promotion of desirable attitudes and behaviors. Simultaneously, however, the school exists to perform certain "public" functions related to the needs and the preservation of society as a whole. These include: the providing of a visibility of community achievement, the status-figure, if you will, in both the physical structure and the program.

The school in its development of new skills and competencies of factual information and social inquiry techniques, is a symbol of hope, pointing toward an upward mobility pattern and the improvement factor indigenous to all who are struggling, consciously or unconsciously, toward self-improvement. And the school is a common body, because most people can share, albeit vicariously, the experience; this "our schools" feeling allows for a power outside of individual, immediate influence.

Finally, the school serves two related and very positive functions: first, it can keep conflict from becoming polarized. In it or through it, political and ideological issues are somehow under an eclectic blanket; everybody gets something even though not everything he thinks he should have; here, if members of the school board are responsive to national issues and to local concerns, there can be controlled controversy. And second, along these lines of reasoning, the school serves as a forum, presenting and hearing the reactionaries, the reformers, the deformers, the liberals, the moderates, the self-proclaimed experts. It can, as well, be a positive outlet for civic-minded groups.

FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD

What then is the role of the school board itself? Legally, in my state of Ohio, and in most of the other 49 states, the sta-

tutes have delegated a portion of the duty to educate the youth to the various school districts created within the state, with the state retaining a degree of supervision and control over the entire education system. School boards are agencies of the state for the organization, administration, and control of the public school system, with board members thus being responsible both to the state itself and to local electors.

Recently (March 24, 1969) one local school board (Cleveland Heights - University Heights, Ohio) explained by a board-enacted resolution its four-part functional obligations: planning, legislating, appraising, interpreting. To paraphrase the board statement:

1. The quality of the planning function, which must be both of a short and long-term nature, will determine in large measure the success of the board's action. (Taken from Basic Boardmanship - - Vance Bell, 1970, OSBA)

2. The legislative function is the development and enactment of policies or educational objectives for its district and the approval of means by which the policies are to be executed.

3. The function of appraising or evaluating is the ascertainment of how the policies are working out and how the district's school system is performing. Evaluation is the only means of learning whether the educational goals adopted by the board are being achieved.

4. Interpreting is a two-directional job of a board of education. The board has the responsibility of interpreting the school's course of studies, its curriculum as well as its needs and desires to the community; and the community's needs, hopes, and desires to the school's professional staff.

Keeping these legally stated and derived-by-inference obligations in mind, it is essential that the board expand its accountability to its "public" or clients - - including the children themselves, their parents, and the others who reside or work in the community served and serviced by the school. Curricula and programs emanating from the board must show responsiveness

to local community needs and reflect both state and national issues, concerns, and crises by establishing realistic and achievable educational goals, i.e., how much and what type of learning opportunities do we want and should we provide in our schools in the light of changing people and changing mores which "change" the community?

USE OF THE INFORMED LAY CITIZEN

All over the country parents of children in the schools and other concerned citizens are demanding -- and achieving -- involvement in the development of educational philosophies for the schools to whom they send precious clients and whose operational expenses they inevitably (albeit frequently unwillingly) assume! Said Ralph W. Tyler,* former chairman of ECAPE and active member of NAEP, "A second by-product . . . is the demonstration that the educational objectives of a school can be formulated and agreed upon in a way that involves parents (and) laymen . . . . This greatly increases the common understanding of what schools are trying to do. Because a major part of the assessment project is to provide helpful information about the progress of education that can be understood and accepted by lay citizens, the procedures used in the construction of assessment exercises involved laymen." (Two of the early conferences, in fact, directed the attention of the laymen panelists toward the minute scrutiny of the developing exercises for qualities of meaningfulness and any possible offensiveness!)

One of the three criteria set by the governing Committee in the development and acceptance of posited objectives was that they must be ones which are acceptable to thoughtful lay adults as reasonable goals of American education to help in eliminating the criticism frequently encountered with current tests in which some item is . . . labeled by prominent laymen as being unimportant."** . . . . "Achievement resulted from the concentrated work of 11 separate panels of laymen living in cities, towns, and rural areas in various parts of the United States. Each panel spent two days examining the material and making a judgment

---

* In "National Assessment - Some Valuable By-Products for Schools," from the National Elementary Principal Journal, May 1969.

** From NAEP literature

about each objective in terms of two questions:

'Is this something important for people to learn today?'

'Is this something I would like to have my children learn?' "

I have described in detail the reliance on lay judgment in National Assessment not only because I am a lay person - - and this is where I came into the project, but especially because the National Assessment project from the beginning and throughout its history has, deliberately and regularly, involved the informed lay person in all of its procedures. (To make the record quite current, I should report that the latest term applied to us, kindly, I hope - but with tongue in cheek, I fear - is "non-academician," bestowed upon that limited number of us who were in Ann Arbor to be briefed the middle of June!)

"A further, sophisticated step in formulating objectives came about with the use of prototype assessment exercises to help clarify the meaning of each statement of objectives. When objectives are so defined, they are likely to be understood by the layman." (And probably, if the truth were told, by the professional as well!) "Abstract statements alone are often so general that they are meaningless or they use trite and hallowed terms like 'citizenship,' which are commonly approved but mean different things to different people. Discussions of objectives, when guided by examples of this sort, are more easily focused on real issues regarding the aims of the school."*

This deliberate involvement of lay persons in National Assessment objectives and exercises should have significant implications on the use of findings derived from the Citizenship area.

RELATIONSHIP OF NATIONAL ASSESSMENT TO THE EDUCATIONAL SCENE

"The assessment should indicate the extent to which our people have attained important educational goals, i.e., have they learned what the schools are expected to teach? Learning is a process of acquiring ways of thinking, feeling, and acting, that is, acquiring patterns of behavior . . . . We need to know what the student is expected to learn in order to assess his

---

* From NAEP literature

achievement. For this reason, educators are writing objectives in terms of the behavior they expect to help students learn.*

And to quote Ralph H. Ojemann again,**

"It frequently is suggested that children at a given age have a greater fund of knowledge than children at the same age of previous generations. It is suggested that television, improved facilities for travel, wider use of audio-visual aids, and greater availability of books (paper-backs) and magazines have made it possible for the younger generation to acquire a broader fund of knowledge than was true in past generations.

"It appears that in knowledge of current events the statement is true. On the other hand, it is evident also that in numerous areas that are of increasing importance for living now and in the future, the youth of today have not gained beyond previous generations. For example, most persons agree that in the present world, and in the future, an understanding of people and why they do what they do is of increasing importance. Nevertheless, there has been little progress in this area. When we examine the behavior of adults we find much of it is characterized by the surface-symptom-treating arbitrary judgmental approach. When we test the present seniors in high school we find similar results. The children coming from our schools, as their parents before them, are trying to live in a world of people without having acquired an elementary understanding of the factors operating in human behavior.

"There is evidence that understanding behavior can be increased significantly by planned programs at the elementary and secondary levels. Such evidence has been available for 15 to 20 years. Nevertheless, an examination of a representative sample of curricula at both the elementary and secondary levels in Ohio schools and an examination of pupils indicates little growth in this area.

"Thus . . . an examination of representative current curricula indicates that there is general disregard of the child's potential of acquiring a functional understanding of the dynamics

---

* From NAEP literature

** Ralph H. Ojemann, "Some New View in Child Development" from Theory Into Practice, June 1970, Columbus, Ohio. The Ohio State University.

of human behavior. Since it is obvious that the child is now living in a world in which he has numerous interactions with other people and since there is every indication that present day children will be living in a future world of more people with more human interactions, we would expect our schools and our research workers to be vitally concerned with the extension and use of our knowledge in this area.

"Thinking adults also realize that in life one has to make numerous decisions by weighing the probable outcome of two or more causes of action. There are numerous daily situations in which one does not have all the information one needs about the future effects of one's actions. In making decisions in such situations the logical procedure is to estimate the probability of alternate courses of action.

"Learning to think in probability terms is basic to learning to live....

"Experiences are needed to develop the ability to draw valid inferences from daily observations. There has been a tendency in educational circles to provide practice in the classroom setting in drawing valid inferences from given or laboratory data, but little practice is provided in applying a similar process to one's daily experiences.

"Another idea in which a fresh look in child development needs to be taken is in the area of moral education. In our present culture, it is common practice to attempt to teach morals by telling a child what is right and wrong and to do this usually without giving the underlying data on which the assertions are based. This dogmatic approach has several effects. On the one hand, making decisions for the child in areas in which he is capable of making decisions for himself, if he were helped to acquire the necessary background, constitutes a serious threat to the child's feeling of personal significance or personal worth. The child soon recognizes that he is thought of as being 'littler' than he is, and this makes it difficult for him to satisfy his desire to feel that he is growing as a person in his own right. The resulting feelings of frustration can lead to various types of behavior including rebellion. Many of the reactions of youth in rejecting the establishment appear to arise from the frustrations young people experience in their attempts to feel that they are growing as significant persons.

"A second effect of the teaching of morals by dictation is overlooking what the child needs to make moral decisions when he is on his own. To make a decision in this area one needs a background in elementary moral philosophy to be able to think one's way through the daily situations involving a determination of right and wrong. Moral philosophers have developed some methods for dealing with such problems and a sensitivity to these methods would seem helpful to young people. Nevertheless, a recent survey of Ohio schools indicates that little is found in the curriculum to teach the elements of the methods for determining right and wrong.* How can we expect children to make moral decisions in the changing situations they face now and will face in the future if they have not acquired the necessary ingredients of methods for making such decisions?

"Our culture is approaching the point at which a fair number of our children will be able to satisfy their needs for food, protection from the elements, and similar basic physical requirements of life. In the past, much of the challenge in life has consisted in providing food, clothes, shelter, and other physical requirements. If these are readily satisfied, there is danger that life will be without challenge and that it will be filled with boredom. There already is ample indication in the affluent communities that boredom is a frequent occurrence. The child needs a challenge beyond the basic necessities. It is not easy to find this challenge. Whittier pointed this out when he wrote 'Peace hath higher tests of manhood than battle ever knew!

"To develop a challenge in living depends upon one's philosophy of life. What does one want to live for? What does one think is worthwhile? When we ask questions we see we are again in the area of a basic philosophy of life and once again our schools are not providing opportunities for our young people to examine critically their ways of living and to develop for themselves a conception of what they want to do with their lives. Such a conception is needed to provide the challenge that lies beyond the physical necessities."**

Lengthy though it is, the foregoing quotation from Dr. Ojemann

---

* Modern Teenage Problems: Report of Family Life Education Survey of Ohio Schools, op. cit.

** Some New View in Child Development, op. cit.

is essential tc a consideration of lay intervention in the educational process to achieve desired objectives through the present medium of the preliminary Citizenship Findings. Results of the as yet unreleased sections should further bolster the growing lay approach to more complete and more influential involvement in making and evaluating educational objectives.

ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT PROJECT!

What we have presented to us at this time are baseline data, indicating where our children and young people are NOW in the achievement or possession of the habits, skills, competencies and developments we have labeled as desirable if not essential objectives. These data reported today will provide the measurable standard for tomorrow. As an integral part of the procedure, certain of the already approved exercises have been retained for administration during the second cycle to provide opportunities for adequate comparisons between initial and subsequent results. New objectives and new exercises will undoubtedly be developed to reflect both the growing precosity and sophistication of our population, and the expected maturation in school curricula. Truly the beauty of this National Assessment project is that it is a living, viable, growing experience, adaptive to people and their environment.

Once the exercises are released, as they are being released this week in Denver, they are in the public domain and so are susceptible to proper use by local school systems. "Proper" as here defined means appropriate modification to the local school community situation (cf. the introduction to this paper wherein is developed the goal and the role of the school, the function of the school board, and the use of the informed lay citizen).

The local decision-maker, for example may superimpose the national results of these preliminary and partial findings onto "citizenship" aspects of his school curricula with the intention of bolstering or enrichening courses of study and humanizing personnel practices in ratio to the results of the exercises as given. On the other hand, the local board member may request that identical or similar exercises be given in his school system. A positive advantage surrounding either approach is that the released exercises were conceived and refined under educationally wholesome circumstances!

Another of the possible alternatives available is the construction of new exercises for the given primary and sub-objectives.

We must keep in mind the concern currently being expressed by the professionals and reiterated by citizens that curricula must provide for experiences that bring about and reinforce acceptable behavior.

Once objectives have been written into our own courses of study and implemented in our classrooms, we must establish our own local baseline data and continue teaching and evaluating and teaching.

Available also to local boards is new knowledge of the efficacy of multiple types of measurement: paper - and - pencil exercises accompanied by tape recordings; strict attention to individual response in order to assure that the individual is not penalized for not being able to read or for simply misunderstanding what he is being asked to do - - individual interviews; special situational measures, such as observation of a group of students interacting. In short, the techniques of test construction and test administration have been materially expanded.

One further generalization I would like to make before treating briefly some of the actual baseline data revealed: legislators responsible for state-wide school financing and state-wide imposition of minimum educational standards can now be better served by their local constituents and by state educational (special interest) groups. Organizations such as the Ohio School Boards Association, which I currently serve as president, for example, should be able - - with data now available from their assessed categories to:

. . . Show concern for the well-being of others;
. . . Know the main structure and functions of our governments;
. . . Participate in Effective Civic Action;
. . . Indicate the needs, objectives, and achievement in the area of citizenship of a cross-sampling of state youngsters.

INFERENCES FOR CURRICULA OF SPECIFIED EXERCISES

A. Concern for Groups Treated Unfairly
Exercise AI (Helping another outside of school)

What part did the school play in this significant growth in the helping-hand relationship indicated, from ages 9 to 13? Should not, moreover, the school emphasize the desirability of this relationship during the primary years?

Exercise A2 (Attitude towards child of jailed father)

These results surprise me: age 13 is notoriously sensitive to "the looks of the thing," whereas age 9 is more innocent of the "guilt by association" feeling.

Exercise A3 (Exclusion of minorities from public park)

Curriculum must stress responsibility of "The many to the few," "The strong to the weak," etc.

Exercise A4 (Attitude towards those of different races)

Taking advantage of the (surprising) indication that there is little rejection of very personal contact with one of another race (dentist or doctor), we should explore methods of creating a climate for a greater acceptance of people as people.

Exercise A5-A6 (Awareness of racial and religious discrimination)

If we believe that one must accept the existence of a problem in order to attack it - - let alone solve it, then we must do a better job of specifying discriminating practices.

Exercise A7 (Membership in anti-discrimination groups)

If we believe that mobilized group action is essential for change, we had better promote the formation of more and varied change-groups and the responsibility of individuals to join them.

Exercise A8 (Knowledge of 'helping' services)

One of my personal biases is that "enthusiasm is never enough" - - nor even to be credited in the absence of knowledge of how to contribute and actual contributory service." Therefore, these evidences of practical knowledge are a reassuring first step to the "helping hand" extension. I am going to suggest to my school system that it make an extensive catalogue of such items to extend our own youngsters' (and adults') capabilities.

D. Know the Main Structures and Functions of our Governments

Exercise D1 (Why do we have a government?)

I would be interested in comparing specific responses made by the three age groups. Inasmuch as the very first years of school still stress the existence of "those who serve us" (the fireman, the policeman, etc.), I am surprised that less than half of the 9-year-olds had positive responses, and intend to examine our curriculum with this in mind.

Exercise D2 (Rights of the President)

Examine the validity of this exercise to be sure "to do anything" is not being confused with "to do everything."

Exercise D3 (Contested elections)

I want my school system to explore the reasons why people should have a choice, (or why not!)

Exercise D4 (Response to constituents)

Here, civics curriculum should include treatment of the ideal vs. the practical; with reference to polls quizzing legislators on this subject as the one reported by our Ohio School Boards Association in a recent Journal.*

---

* "A Survey of Sources of Influence on Ohio Legislators Concerning Three Bills," Richard W. Saxe and David S. Rosenberger, Ohio School Boards Journal, 1969.

Exercise D5-9, D10-D12 (Structure and Operation of Government)

I disagree with some of my fellow panelists from the recent Ann Arbor conference in believing strongly in the importance of our youth having factual knowledge as well as structural understanding of our government. I think the school must constantly reinforce the union of these two skills in the development of a citizen who votes out of wisdom rather than by just randomly exercising his prerogative.

E-Participate in Effective Civic Action
Exercise E1-E6 (Influencing Government)

All I can do here is underscore the comment from the assessors that there is a wide difference between what people think can be done to influence legislators and other public officials and decision-shapers, and what they actually do, with a strong recommendation that schools must train individuals to take part in the political process!

Exercise E7 (Public expression of views)

This, to me, was probably the most fascinating of all the exercises, with tremendous possibilities for replication in school situation and implications for training - - teaching the child. Can we develop the skill of disagreeing without being disagreeable, for example? What is a leader? - - - - Is it too much to project the possibility based on these results that there might be a solution to student dissent - - out of guided student expression?

Exercise E8 (Campaigning for someone else)

I shall suggest an examination of campaign practices relating to our own in-school organizations to determine whether procedures might be built in that would contribute to participation in the "real" political arena. Also, I recommend a special sampling of 17-year-olds, at least, following the November '70 election to establish whether the climate of those past weeks led to more involvement politically.

Exercise E9-E12 (Volunteering and Club Membership)

Does the school adequately encourage wholesome volunteering

and mass support of "worthy" projects?

Exercise E13-E14 (Group Effectiveness)

Again, as in E7, my reactions to these exercises is highly positive, and without going into details I urge the use of this technique in our classrooms.

CONCLUSION

Having had the experience of being associated with National Assessment since 1965, I am gratified to be able to react, even in this cursory and too-superficial fashion to the initial CITIZENSHIP findings. I repeat my suggestions to the local, lay decision maker made in the Assessment of the Assessment Project! section, and add a recommendation for an in-depth examination of results, attention to the most effective means of using them locally, and a constant monitoring of the school curricula with the NA-posited primary and subobjectives in mind. I would further suggest that the "informed lay person," herein newly involved in a new process, would do well to improve his own evaluative skills in order to justify this sharing, even temporarily, in the decision-making process with the professionals - - albeit in the interests of his own children and youth!

Jean Dye is a member of the board of education of Cleveland Heights and University Heights, Ohio City School District. She earned her B. A. at Oberlin College and has had wide and varied experience in education, family service, welfare, human relations, Camp Fire Girls, Boy Scouts and personnel activities. She has taught high school English and speech and contributed articles to educational journals. She is currently President of the Ohio School Boards Association, and Vice-President-Director of the Department of Education, Ohio PTA.

COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY AND PARTIAL FINDINGS OF NATIONAL ASSESSMENT IN THE AREA OF CITIZENSHIP

Harold H. Eibling

It is an honor to have been asked to be a member of the Citizenship review panel at the unveiling of the first data to be released from the National Assessment. The scholarly way in which the entire assessment was developed, the care with which the objectives were evolved, the meticulous and often innovative ways in which the information was obtained, and the skill with which the statistics are treated have alleviated many of the initial misgivings about the beneficial effects of the assessment on American education.

Many years must go by, much research must be done and experience gained before the full impact of the assessment can itself be assessed. Educators and non-academicians alike must learn how best to use this new kind of information on the educational attainments of our youth and young adults. The measurement of progress in education, one of the goals of the National Assessment, will require an even longer span of time. It is, therefore, a hazard to make sweeping predictions or broad generalizations about the entire assessment from the small amount of the data we now have available.

There are a number of refreshing things about the National Assessment which have impressed me.

1. The objectives were adopted only after agreement by representative committees of scholars, school professionals and thoughtful lay citizens. While the objectives do not cover the entire education spectrum, they nonetheless state rather well the common core of learnings most people feel are important to all young people.

2. Many of the questions and tasks (called exercises) used in the assessment represent an interesting departure from the over-used multiple-choice syndrome of standardized testing. The many kinds of exercises used make it possible to obtain certain types of important information which more limited tests so frequently avoid.

3. The sample was taken in such a way that pupil is not pitted against pupil, school against school or even state versus state. National Assessment was not intended to be a contest.

4. At this point, at least, the National Assessment group is not attempting interpretations or judgments relative to the data. The information is merely furnished so that people with many interests may use this creatively in helping to solve their own educational problems.

5. No norms have been established. Half the population will not be "put down" by being labeled as <u>below average</u> because of the way in which they understand and answer questions.

6. With the increased insistence on accountability, the National Assessment may well provide a much-needed base from which progress in attaining educational goals can be measured over a period of years, at least within those areas contained in the assessment. One difficulty in using present standardized tests for this purpose is that they are generally renormed about every time progress becomes apparent.

I am particularly pleased that Citizenship is one of the 10 areas assessed, even though it is not generally thought of in terms of courses or an academic discipline, as are most of the other areas. During this period of strain in our national life it is especially important to consider what constitutes "good" citizenship, to develop specific goals, and to measure whether these goals are being attained. American citizens need to develop more effective citizenship practices; National Assessment should help us meet this need. The goals specified by the National Assessment center around civic behavior rather than knowledge of what is proper behavior. Of course, knowledge and behavior are related, but educators too often assume a direct relationship. The report should be given a special commendation for developing evaluative devices to measure one's compassion for others. In an age of increasing depersonalization, compassion for and sensitivity to others are essential ingredients in good citizenship. It is doubtful if intellect without compassion can serve the world well. Sensitivity and empathy are initial steps toward effective civic behavior.

The National Assessment continually reminds one that it is not enough to be informed and analytical; an education which develops commitment is increasingly essential in our home, our neighborhood, our nation and our world.

Any attempt to measure the affective realm brings questions to the minds of educators. One may rightly question the importance of school in affecting attitudes. Research shows that preschool experiences have a tremendous influence on values and that these are probably fairly well formed by the time the child enters school. Since the early experiences are so important, can schools really hope to influence behavior in significant and lasting ways? How important is this question for educators when they analyze the results of the National Assessment?

Another question for educators is how much of the behavior of students is influenced by out-of-school experiences. The peer group seems to be a highly controlling factor for many teenagers. Voting behavior studies indicate that this is also more than a small element in determining the behavior of adults. Of course, being influenced by peers is not necessarily bad. Educators must examine ways of using this influence as a positive factor in developing good citizens. There is a tendency by some educators to assume that a student's behavior is only important in school. The National Assessment takes a much broader view and rightly so. The approach here is to emphasize the broad range of civic achievement.

Traditionally, when educators seek evidence of success, they measure knowledge, even though continually declaring the importance of attitudes and values. The National Assessment will encourage educators to attempt to measure their effectiveness outside of the cognitive realm, difficult as this may be.

In drawing conclusions concerning that part of the assessment being released, there is a danger of equating good citizenship solely with involvement. The attempts to measure quality by having the interviewer explain what action to take is commendable, but care must be exercised not to treat a wide range of actions equally, again substituting the quantitative for the qualitative. Could there, then, be a more significant quality factor introduced in some way? If controversy would result, then perhaps citizenship is not defined as well as we think.

For example, is it enough to measure only the number of actions a child or adult could take to stop discrimination without attaching the judgmental factor?

Before examining the material that is being presented at this time from the Citizenship area of the National Assessment, I feel it is particularly important that the complete list of Citizenship objectives be studied carefully so that this small sample of the total area may be considered in its full context. Let me illustrate. Parts A and E center mostly on minority groups and race relations, certainly a highly important and appropriate concern in the contemporary societal life in the United States. There are also urgent problems of international relations, personal responsibility, employment, family life, safety, environment, law and order, loneliness and health, to name a few. A reading of the objectives will show that many of these are also made a matter of assessment within the entire scope of the Citizenship and Social Studies areas.

At this time we can only surmise the long-term effects that the National Assessment will have on education in the United States. Certainly, there are some pitfalls that should be avoided. First of all, it should be realized that National Assessment does not pretend to define a complete curriculum or to imply that only those objectives which have been explored are of importance to the education of the young. Educators and the public alike must expect a continuous development of the curriculum to meet the ever-changing educational needs in this complex society. A "freezing" of objectives for education would certainly have an unfortunate effect. I understand that there will be a continuous study of the assessment objectives in this respect. No doubt commercial organizations, school systems and even states will attempt to gather information on a more limited sample to compare local results with the assessment results. This can result in true benefit, however, only if the methods and real purposes of the National Assessment are not compromised. Obtaining information from an adequate sample through interviews and small group techniques is an expensive business. Again, causing teachers to "teach for the test" through the addition of a competitive factor to assessment could also result in undesirable consequences.

Another concern is one common to all kinds of measurement of educational progress. Even though attempts were made to assess

broad objectives of education through new and imaginative exercises, a predominance of the exercises among those presented seem to check on information. While the assimilation of a store of knowledge is a worthy goal of education, it is also one of the lower levels of teaching. The cognitive ability to classify, to identify problems and to formulate and test hypotheses is a higher level of learning. This is rarely assessed in the exercises presented. It may be found more in parts not yet released.

In commenting more specifically on some of the exercises from the three parts of the Citizenship area that are presented, I was encouraged by the large percentage of the 9-year-olds (47%) who have taken part in civic projects. It was surprising to learn that only 66% of the 13-year-olds stated that they were aware of racial discrimination in the United States, and that 56% of this age level were unable to cite "at least one example of racial discrimination in the world," particularly since minority groups constituted a significant part of the sample.

In category D, the respondents were generally familiar with the workings of government, although only 18% of the 17-year-olds could write the last names of the senators from their states - probably a cause of concern for persons in elective offices as well as for educators. Exercise E-7 produced at least a mild surprise when 32% more of the 13-year-olds than the 17-year-olds volunteered a contrary opinion once an initial position had been stated by another member of the group. Are these 17-year-olds more susceptible to group pressures than their younger contemporaries?

Many of the other exercises pose intriguing possibilities for further analysis in terms of curriculum and instruction, for example, A-2, A-3, A-4, A-8, D-14, E-1, E-7, E-9 and E-13. It appears likely that education will be influenced by the type as well as the content of the exercises, which in most instances are superior to the items in the usual fact-oriented tests. Certainly, this type of assessment should fit in well with the multi-sensory approach to education, where many types of learning situations and media are used to enhance the learning situation.

In conclusion, it appears that the assessment of citizenship on a national scale should certainly serve to emphasize the significance of personal involvement in the improvement of our society. The statement of Citizenship objectives may well serve as a model for many schools and teachers who wish to clarify their purposes in this area. Knowing how young people visualize their citizenship roles, their knowledge of our governmental institutions, their attitudes and their ways of acting are highly significant to the continued improvement of the type of citizenship education needed for the success of a viable democratic society.

Dr. Eibling, superintendent of the Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools, earned his B. S. at Ohio Northern University, M. A. and Ph.D. degrees at Ohio State University and his LL.D. at Miami University at Oxford, Ohio. He has been a teacher, principal and superintendent, is author of a number of widely used textbooks on American history, is president of the American Association of School Adminstrators.

CRITICAL RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT

Tobe Johnson

A. Purpose of Study

I was profoundly disturbed by what I perceived as the purpose of National Assessment, namely to determine "how much good is the expenditure of so much money doing, in terms of what America knows and can do?"

I would like to suggest two parallel questions that might be raised about the purpose of National Assessment:

1. In view of what we now know about the distribution of Title I Funds for so-called disadvantaged schools, how can we say that all of the money allocated for the various target populations in fact reaches them?

2. What responsibility does the National Assessment have for seeing to it that its "value neutral" findings are used to provide further rationalizations for failing to increase the allocation of resources to historically disadvantaged segments of the population?

B. Methodology

I would need more information on the sample and research procedures used in this assessment in order for me to evaluate it adequately. Such information would include, but not be limited to, answering the following questions:

1. Who were the interviewers (e.g., race, sex)?

2. Were there any black-to-white interviews or vice versa?

3. How were interviews in desegregated settings handled?

4. Do the questions within the individual exercises constitute a scale? And if so, would it not be helpful to check the "global" responses against the responses to the individual items?

5. It would have been helpful if the report had noted whether substitute questions for those like A-3 were given minority respondents.

Although the majority of my observations are either implicitly or explicitly critical, I would like to commend the researchers for their efforts to reach poor or non-readers through tape-accompanied pen-and-paper exercises, and I look forward to learning the differences this procedure made in the responses received. I also would like to commend the researchers for their efforts in developing a procedure for observing group interaction.

C. Citizenship Objectives

1. Who were the people who developed "the standards or objectives of citizenship"?

2. The community roles seem to be entirely conventional elitist ones. What about such roles as those of community action participants, young college dissenters and radical blacks?

3. In exercises like A-3 and A-4, I would have wanted to see the extent to which respondents' deeds match their professions, particularly in view of the high number of respondents who said they don't mind a person of a minority group living next door to them. Could a verification probe have been used here?

D. Know the Main Structures and Functions of our Governments

1. I am not clear whether the range of functions listed as acceptable for government to perform (D-1) are idealized ones or whether the assessment attempts to suggest what governments in fact do -- for example, a clear function of government in Mississippi is to preserve traditional white supremacy by force of arms if necessary.

2. Do any of the questions deal with "C" of the objectives ("Recognize the Importance of Political Opposition and Interest Groups"), particularly with reference to nontraditional kinds of opposition groups like the Students for a Democratic Society and the Black Panthers?

E. Participate in Effective Civic Action

The several interpretations of the results in this section suggest that the responses should be considered as exploratory only. It is important, however, that a clarification be made as early as possible on the responses to the question of how citizens perceive their influence, and understand the ways in which government might be influenced. What the question might be tapping is a pervasive feeling of powerlessness among the citizenry. The results of other opinion studies would support this hypothesis.

My general response to exercises E-13 and E-14 is that they are rather pallid simulations of the kind of effective cooperation essential to getting complex and controversial things done cooperatively in this society - - and which will be, increasingly, the real test of effective citizenship, and even the survival of this country as a nation state. Exercise E-13 measures cooperation only at the cognitive level - - that is, orientation toward a simple task where goals and values are not in conflict. The same is largely true of Exercise E-14, though the possibilities of divergent opinions are greater here. It would be interesting to know something about the variance in levels of cooperation, especially on E-14, which might have occurred among heterogeneous groups as contrasted with more homogeneous ones.

Dr. Tobe Johnson is professor of political science at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, where he did his undergraduate work. He received his Ph.D. in political science from Columbia University. Dr. Johnson taught for a year at Prairie View College in Prairie View, Texas before joining the Morehouse faculty in 1963. In 1965-66 he was visiting associate professor in public and international affairs at the University of Pittsburgh. At Morehouse he is coordinator of freshman social sciences and director of the Morehouse Self Study Program. He is currently making a study of three Southern cities on a Ford grant, which will be published early next year.

THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION ASSESSMENT: STRENGTHS OF THE REPORT

Lawrence E. Metcalf

The strengths of the report are many. First, it is to be noted that the assessment effort behind the report exemplifies cooperation between scholars, school people, and concerned lay citizens. The participation of scholars gives expert opinion a proper role in identification of objectives and construction of test exercises consistent with those objectives. The participation of school people enabled the project to screen out those objectives not normally pursued by the schools. And, finally, the participation of lay persons enabled the project to determine whether the stated objectives were acceptable to the general public.

A second strength of the report is the care and precision with which a representative sample was drawn. Any reader of the report can be confident that the reported data are very probably representative of the national population in this country. The sample can be broken down into components that reveal differences between regions, between large and small schools, between rural and urban communities, and between social-economic classes. By looking at differential responses across ages one can get a picture of progress or its lack as young people move through the educational system from pre-adolescence to late adolescence and adulthood.

A third strength is the fact that invasion of privacy is avoided. It is not possible from the report to determine how well an individual pupil or school system is doing in citizenship learnings. The tests used to gather data for the report are not achievement tests in the usual sense. Readers of the report may wonder how well a particular school system is doing. They will not be able to tell from this report. They can only learn how well the nation as a whole, or regions within the nation, are doing with respect to certain citizenship education objectives.

A fourth strength of the report is the precision of behavioral detail with which objectives are stated. We have had far too many reports based upon vague and glittering generalities having to do with high national purpose. It is a civic education

in itself merely to read these objectives as they have been defined by the project. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of these objectives for civic behavior. To take but one example, consider the objective of supporting rationality in communication, thought, and action on social problems. This appears to be an objective so vague in its nature that no progress or lack of progress toward its achievement could ever be ascertained in any scientific sense. Yet the project personnel were able to define this objective quite precisely, a necessary first step toward assessing its achievement. We hear it said on all sides these days that young people are less rational and more impulsive and intuitive in their problem-solving than older people. When data on this portion of the final report become available, we should be able to make some defensible assertions in this regard.

A fifth strength is the fact that the test exercises in addition to being consistent with the objectives vary as to type and level of difficulty. The exercises used to collect data are not limited to verbal and factual responses but include performance tasks. Consequently, the report reveals what people do as well as what they say and know. Both lay citizens and professional experts participated in construction of the various test exercises. And finally, the total test represents a range of items extending from the very easy to the very difficult exercise.

WEAKNESSES OF THE REPORT

When one reads the detailed description of some of the objectives, one cannot help wondering about the responses a black ghetto family might make to those descriptions. A perusal of the persons and institutions represented on the various panels suggests that some important groups in American society have not been represented. The personnel reads too much like a sample drawn from white, middle-class, and professional backgrounds. The poor, black, radical, and violent are absent or unrepresented. The most radical group mentioned is the League of Women Voters. And the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is no longer regarded by many black people as their most effective and representative civic lobby. It is no wonder, then, that descriptions of good civic behavior in the family read like exemplars from Dick and Jane readers.

The section on international relations reveals a bias in favor of the present system of international relations with a peculiarly American emphasis upon Cold War conflicts and communist subversion. For example, Objective VI-A includes the following statement: "They are aware that Communist China and the USSR seek, or have sought in the recent past, the subversion and violent overthrow of all non-Communist governments in the world; . . . . " This statement overlooks important differences between China and Russia, and reflects the all too common view in America that Communism is a monolithic and united foe. But more to the point is the fact that many scholars and citizens outside this country do not share this view of the world. The project need not choose between an American and a non-American view of the world but rather should strive to state views of objectives that are not tainted by any semblance of ethnocentrism. A statement of the earth as spaceship together with an awareness of the problems of pollution, poverty, population, and war as unmanageable dilemnas under a decentralized international system would be no more biased than the above description of the Communist world, and a great deal more realistic.

A third weakness in the report is the apparent assumption that much of citizenship education cannot begin in the early school years. Time after time, objectives are not defined for 9- and 13-year-olds. Under V-D, for example, only adults are expected to participate in local, state, and national governmental processes. It is assumed that adults can attend council meetings and public hearings. Why not 17-year-olds? Indeed, why not 13-year-olds? One senses that the project had difficulty in defining many of the objectives of citizenship education in terms that would have meaning for 9- and 13-year-olds.

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

For most objectives the reported data indicate progress as learners age and mature. But there are some exceptions. On items that indicate activism in the respondents young people are more likely to be active in civic roles. There are exceptions to this generalization, but the general picture is one of adults who are too busy or indifferent to participate in group activities of a civic nature. An apathetic adult American tends to be the model that young people see before them.

INTERPRETATION

With a few exceptions the report is descriptive rather than interpretive. One interpretation that is tempting is probably also in error; and that is any tendency to credit or blame the schools for any problems or lack of progress revealed by the report. It would be more realistic to attribute results to all the learning experiences of the people, and not merely to what happens in school. If Americans are apathetic toward civic action, this could be due as much to the influence of the entire culture as to that part of the culture represented by the schools.

Dr. Lawrence E. Metcalf is professor of education at the University of Illinois. He received his B.S., M.A. and Ph.D. in education at Ohio State University. He has taught and served as a principal of secondary schools in Ohio and was on the faculties of Goddard College and the University of Georgia before joining the faculty of the University of Illinois. Dr. Metcalf is editor-in-chief of high school publications of the World Law Fund.

REACTION TO NATIONAL ASSESSMENT - CITIZENSHIP

Thomas Rondeau

As I read the preliminary and partial findings of National Assessment in the area of Citizenship, I could not help thinking of Robert F. Mager's delightful little book, Preparing Instructional Objectives. In his preface he tells the story of a Sea Horse who one day gathered up his pieces of eight and rode off to seek his fortune. Along the way he met Eel who sold him a flipper so that he might find his fortune faster. Soon after that he met Sponge who sold him a jet propelled scooter which made it possible for him to proceed at an even greater rate of speed. Friend Sea Horse finally met Shark who told him he could save a lot of time by taking a short cut through his open mouth. Sea Horse thanked him and zoomed off into Shark's interior.

The moral of this little story is that if you don't know where you are going, you may end up some place else without knowing it.

As a teacher, that story has stuck with me. It has proven a constant reminder of the need to know (1) what you want to do; (2) how you can be sure you've done it; and (3) what procedures and materials will work best to accomplish what you want to do.

It is quite apparent, to me at least, that the NAEP staff has not been devoured by the shark. It has been well aware of its task, and I believe it has accomplished it using some very effective materials and procedures. NAEP has provided the American public with what looks like the first successful attempt to determine just where we stand in the area of Citizenship. It leaves to the American public the implications of the findings.

There have been many and there will be many more people who claim that NAEP is a deliberate attempt to force a national curriculum. I suspect that the objectives, the Citizenship objectives at least, represent a national consensus. They evolved from the combined efforts of people from every walk of life in the United States.

I for one would find it difficult to understand how anyone could take umbrage with the objectives. They represent, I feel, what our society does or at least, should stand for. I can understand someone who felt they were concerned about the way these objectives were being achieved or not achieved in our society today. If the objectives themselves mean a national curriculum, so be it.

I was impressed with the degree of achievement scored by all age levels in the objectives I examined. It reinforces my belief that a truly national consensus does exist concerning what good citizenship is. It also indicates to me that our society is doing a fine job in developing good citizens, in spite of some evidence to the contrary.

Although the NAEP data does reveal a high degree of achievement and attainment, it also reveals that as a society we have an imposing task before us.

We are living in a period of national history characterized by a host of national and international problems. Our basic institutions are under heavy attack. There is evidence that the citizens of the United States are becoming politically, socially and intellectually polarized into two opposing camps.

The objectives of good citizenship are sound, but simple reverence for them will not be enough in the undoubtedly troubled days which lie ahead. Somehow we must avoid encouraging movement, change and agitation for their own sakes. We must instead encourage and enhance the development of better citizens who are knowledgeable about their rights, their duties and the limitations of reasonable choice in their own society and in the world.

Mr. Rondeau is a classroom teacher in Wauwatosa East High School, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Wisconsin, and has studied at the University of Hawaii's East-West Center in the Asian Studies Program. Mr. Rondeau has worked for five years as a

trials teacher for the High School Geography Project, and has participated in many short workshops and institutes for the National Science Foundation. He has taught at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, Western Michigan University, and Mt. St. Paul College in Waukesha, Wisconsin. He is a member of the National Education Association and the National Council for Social Studies, having served as president of the Wisconsin Council for Social Studies.

☆GPO 830-213